

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 20, 21, and 26 have been amended as shown at pages 2-6 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Rayyan for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on June 28, 2007. Examiner was contacted to discuss the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). A draft Reply was presented to the Examiner with amendments to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 and amendments to more clearly identify the novel features of the claims. Examiner Rayyan believed the amendments did address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 identified in the Office Action. Examiner indicated that further search and consideration was required to determine if the claims would be allowed over the cited prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-9, 10-13, 17-20 and 26-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 10-13, 17-20 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 10, 20 and 26 have been amended to address any issues related to this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) in view of Gottsman *et al.* (US 6,134,548) in view of Brown *et al.* (US 6,405,192). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The subject invention relates to enhancing the results of a query by employing user defined preferences against the query results. For example, query results can be examined semantically to identify user interests and a thumbnail summary can be generated. In another example, links within a query result can be examined for content type, such as text, images, and links. A percentage of content type as compared to the total content in the linked document can be conveyed to the user. The user can then employ this information to determine if following the link will provide value. A user looking for Picasso paintings may be inclined to follow a link that contains a high percentage of image content. Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 10, 20, 21 and 26) recites ***user-dependent query result information including an indication of percentage of a content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document in the query result.***

As conceded in the Office Action, Kravets *et al.* (US 6,363,377) and Gottsman *et al.* fail to teach or suggest performing any analysis of links within the query results. Brown *et al.* is cited to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kravets *et al.* and Gottsman *et al.* However, contrary to assertions in the Office Action, the cited reference fails to provide any indication of percentage of content type as *compared to total content* in the linked document. Brown *et al.* discloses a query system that employs link analysis to identify query terms in linked documents that are of interest to a user. The section of prior art cited discloses an indicator providing a percentage of broken links compared to good links. This does not provide a indication of percentage of links as compared to the total content with a linked document. There is no suggestion or teaching within Brown *et al.* of a percentage providing a comparison of a particular content type, for example image, text, or links, against the total content of a linked document.

Moreover, independent claim 21 recites *the thumbnail view includes an indication of percentage of at least one of text, image and links content type as compared to total content within at least one linked document in the query result*. As discussed above, Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* fail to teach or suggest percentage of a content type as compared to total content within a linked document. Additionally, Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.* are silent regarding providing this percentage or any other indication within a thumbnail image. Brown *et al.* discloses providing some supporting information, although not the percentage noted *supra*, alongside of thumbnail images. However, Brown *et al.* does not teach providing a percentage within a thumbnail image.

In view of at least the foregoing, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Kravets *et al.*, Gottsman *et al.*, and Brown *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 20, 21 and 26 (and claims 2-9, 11-19, 22-25, and 27-29 that respectfully depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP559US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731